



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,151	01/14/2002	Aaron Hal Dinwiddie	RCA 89642	6303

7590 08/13/2008
Joseph S Tripoli
Thomson Multimedia Licensing Inc
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

FEATHERSTONE, MARK D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

1. Applicant's arguments filed 17 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicants argument that Kim does not replace the password in the temporary memory, the examiner relied on the cited passage (column 6, lines 26-47) in Kim to teach that a password could be read into a memory from a removable memory in order to be used to change an access level (access to restriction change is not granted without password). The cited passage in Knowles (paragraph 0072, lines 11-12, 1-4, and paragraph 0074, line 9) discloses that different passwords are used to view different content from a different content provider, such that the password is replaced depending on which content provider is being used. The two references, together in combination, teach that a second password that pertains to access levels can be read in from a removable storage medium in order to be used to unlock content. Therefore, the password that is inputted from the removable medium, as taught by Kim is used by the system of Knowles (as Knowles teaches a different inputted password for a separate service provider) to view the desired content from the service provider.

In response to applicants argument that the examiner did not address limitations of claim 12 by addressing the limitation of "a receiver and processing circuits", examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 1 and 5 both refer to an apparatus that receives content from programming sources, corresponding to a receiver, which inherently has "processing circuits" that process the incoming data as is well-known in the art.

Knowles (Figure 1B and [0075]) discloses a set top box (depacketizer and decoder that receive the input signal and produce an output to the tuners) that receives and processes an incoming signal.

In response to applicant's argument that the cited references do not teach "a first password associated with a first programming provider...a second password associated with a second programming provider" as stated in claims 1 and 12, examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the final office action, Knowles discloses in paragraph 0074 that "Multiple independent IPGs, one for each source are provided. Each IPG has its own user-configurable data such as channel lineup, list of favorite channels, and set of passwords".

In response to applicant's argument that the combination results in substantial reconstruction and redesign of the elements shown in Knowles or Kim, examiner respectfully disagrees. The Knowles reference does teach that multiple sources of programming are combined at the head-end and delivered to the customer and the Eyer reference teaches that a set top box at the customer site can receive information directly from a variety of satellite and cable TV networks. They system could work in conjunction, that is, multiple sources of programming could be received at the head-end as taught by Knowles, and sent to the network operators, such as satellite, cable, etc. as stated in paragraph 0103) The system of Eyer can receive transmission directly from a satellite or cable provider. The user could receive the same channel (as originated from the system of Knowles) from both cable and satellite provider and access the programming with a second password of the IPG (that corresponds to the first

password, or to a lower level password). As stated in the office action dated 05/27/2008, the motivation to combine the references would have been to receive IPG data from a plurality of sources, including local and global services.

With respect to applicant's argument that the Knowles reference is not a proper reference in that it leads away from the claimed invention, examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in #4 above, both features could exist in a combined system, and would not cause a substantial redesign of the system.

With respect to applicant's argument that the references do not teach a first master password associated with a satellite transmission media and a second master password, examiner respectfully disagrees. To clarify, with respect to the Knowles reference, Knowles teaches a hierarchy of passwords in that a master password will potentially have access to all programming, and a lower level password will have potentially access to less programming. However, Knowles clearly states in paragraph 0073 that each programming source can have its own IPG, and own set of passwords. Therefore, each source will have a "master password", and lower level passwords. It is respectfully submitted that Knowles does teach this feature.